

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE-United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILIN	IG DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/778,971	02/02/2001		John D. Shaughnessy	D6138	3345
75	90	02/25/2004		EXAMINER	
Benjamin Aaro			YAEN, CHRISTOPHER H		
ADLER & ASS 8011 Candle La		5	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Houston, TX 77071			1642		
				DATE MAILED: 02/25/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	09/778,971	SHAUGHNESSY, JOHN D.					
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Christopher H Yaen	1642					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe							
THE REPLY FILED 20 January 2004 FAILS TO PLACE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION I	TION FOR ALLOWANCE.  ation. A proper reply to a  n places the application in					
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]						
<ul> <li>a)</li></ul>	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	f extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply be later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or					
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF							
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	·					
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);					
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);							
<ul><li>(c) they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	n better form for appeal by mater	rially reducing or simplifying the					
(d) they present additional claims without cancelli	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.					
NOTE:							
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ion(s): <u>112, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph writter</u>	description.					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed amendment					
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .							
i. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.							
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.							
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: 1 and 5-8.							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	oved or b)⊡ disapproved by th	ne Examiner.					
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen							
10. Other:	21						
TA P	RRY R. HELMS, PH.D RIMARY EXAMINER	Christopher Yaen Art Unit 1642					

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the arguments presented by applicant are substantially similar to those previously presented. The claimed nucleic acid sequence although related to the IL-17 receptor family, does not have utility, wherien a utility such as treatment of a disease or correlation to a specific disease, has been associated. Applicant's assertions have not been supported by facts to indicate a credible, substantial, or specific utility..

LARRY R. HELDES, PH.D.